DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 291 CE 067 448

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | An Analysis of the Distribution of Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Funds among Eligible Recipients. |
| INSTITUTION | Nevada State Council on Occupational Education, Carson City. |
| PUB DATE | Mar 94 |
| NOTE | 33p.; Document contains small print. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research/Technical (143) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Community Colleges; *Financial Support; Position Papers; *Resource Allocation; Rural Areas; Secondary Education; State Federal Aid; *Statewide Planning; Tables (Data); *Technology Education; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Carl D Perkins Voc and Appl Techn Educ Act 1990; *Nevada |

ABSTRACT

The distribution of Perkins Act funds among eligible Nevada recipients was analyzed. The analysis established that passage of the Perkins Act did nothing to improve the ability of small rural districts to participate in the federal program and significantly restricted the amount of funds provided to those vocational programs that do not have high percentages of disabled and/or disadvantaged students. The Perkins Act has also removed set-asides for adult and postsecondary occupational education (OE) programs and obligated the state to determine the instructional level split of funds. Originally, the Nevada Council on Occupational Education endorsed a 75%-25% split of funds among secondary and community college OE programs. The council's endorsement was based not on consideration of program needs or enrollments but rather on the lack of long-term planning and documentation for community college OE programs. Changes that have since occurred in community colleges' planning and recordkeeping have produced additional data that have led the council to reconsider its original funding recommendation. The council now recommends a split of 68% and 32% to secondary and postsecondary programs, respectively. (Appended are 14 tables detailing the distribution of funds among secondary school districts and community colleges.) (MN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION

# OF

# CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND APPLIED TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACT FUNDS AMONG ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS

MARCH 1994

ED 375 291

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M Rader

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 067 448

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Nevada Council On Occupational Education

Jeanne Jones, President
Small Business/State JTCC

Douglas Burris, First Vice-President
Postsecondary

Charlene Rogerson, Second Vice-President
Special Populations

Erik Beyer, Past President
Industry

Elsie Doser
Postsecondary

Claudette Enus
Industry

Ted Finneran
Business

Kathleen Frosini
Secondary

Floyd 'Wayne' Grimes
Labor

David Howard
Business

Phillip 'Pancho' Williams
Labor

John Mathews
Agriculture

Cliff McClain
Postsecondary

Michael L. Rask
Executive Director

Rose Mary Johnson
Administrative
Assistant

# An Analysis of the Distribution

# of

# Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Funds Among Eligible Recipients

A Report Prepared By:

The Nevada Council on Occupational Education

In
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
of Public Law 101-392

March 1994

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION

OF

CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND APPLIED
TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACT FUNDS
AMONG ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS


AN ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS..... Page 1

Community College and Secondary School Distribution Participation..... Page 1

Distribution of Funds Among Secondary School Districts... Page 2

Distribution of Funds Among Community Colleges..... Page 3

Division of Funds Between Secondary and Postsecondary Levels of Instruction..... Page 3

CLOSING CONSIDERATIONS..... Page 4

Planning and Record Keeping..... Page 5

Program Changes 1983-1993..... Page 7

Current Condition in Occupational Education and Work Preparation..... Page 8

RECOMMENDATION..... Page 10

LIST OF APPENDIX..... Page 11

An Analysis of the Distribution
of
Federal Vocational Education Funds

Community College and Secondary School District Participation -The enactment of U.S. Public Law 94-482, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, brought a new emphasis to vocational education. For the first time in the history federal support of vocational education services were refocused from the general improvement of all vocational services to emphasis on very narrowly defined services directed to improve the employability of special populations: the handicapped, the educationally and economically disadvantaged, adults and postsecondary students, single parents and displaced homemakers, and individuals within the correctional system.

From Fiscal Year 1984 until 1991, funds were broken into two categories. Part A funds, Basic Grants, were distributed by formula to the secondary school districts and community colleges. Part B funds, which were set aside for program improvement, were for the most part distributed to the eligible recipients based upon proposals submitted in response to statewide priorities. For the seven fiscal years noted 57% of the total available funds were distributed under Part A, and 43% of the funds under Part B. Each recipient was required to match the federal funds they received on a dollar-for-dollar basis from agency, state and local funds.

Prior to Fiscal Year 1984, Nevada had seventeen school districts and four community colleges who routinely participated in the federal vocational education program. Narrowly defined categories of funds use and matching requirements, which specified that the match for Part A funds must be over and above the operational cost of a regular (academic) program (known as excess cost), began to narrow the number of school districts who chose to participate in the federal funding program.

While the number of participating secondary districts varied from a high of twelve to a low of six, the number stabilized at nine by Fiscal Year (FY) 1990. In 1986 one community college chose not to participate. While the number of participating agencies declined throughout the 1980s, each agency was able to benefit from those activities for program improvement which were operated on statewide priorities.

The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Public Law 101-392, did nothing to improve the ability of small rural districts to participate in the federal program. The federal funds available for statewide

program improvement has declined from 4% of the State's allocation to 8.35% in FY92, 7.5% in FY93, and 7.5% for FY94.* Not only has current regulations reduced the total participating agencies to 13, but there is no longer a major statewide program improvement initiative which would benefit the non-participating agencies.

Under Public Law 101-392, Part C, the Basic Grant funds have been further restricted since FY91. Basic Grant funds must be used in a limited number of schools or programs which have the highest density of handicapped and disadvantaged students. The use of funds are highly restricted when considering the regular vocational education student and program. Districts whose allocation by formula falls below a threshold of $15,000 (no community college may be given a grant which is less than $50,000) may not receive funds unless they join with other districts or community colleges to form a consortium whose total allocation reaches the minimum funding level (Section 231(b).

Distribution of Funds Among Secondary School Districts - The formula used to determine how much money a school district is eligible for is split into three factors:

1. 70% of the funds are distributed on the basis of the number of Section 1005 students served under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act compared to all Section 1005 students in the State (economically disadvantaged students);

2. 20% of the funds are distributed on the basis of the number of students with handicaps who have individualized education programs under Section 614(a)(5) in the Education of the Handicapped Act served by a school district compared to all Section 614(a)(5) students in the State: and

3. 10% of the basic grant funds are distributed on the basis of the number of secondary and adult students served the previous fiscal year compared to all of the secondary and adult students served by the school districts statewide the prior fiscal year.

---

* Fiscal Year 1992, 1993 and 1994 Worksheets for Determining Basic Grant Setaside Amounts and Hold Harmless, Nevada Department of Education, June 1993.

AN ANALYSIS OF ALL FORMULA PROCESSES AND CALCULATIONS PREPARED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 231 OF PUBLIC LAW 101-392 (SEE APPENDIX A).

Distribution of Funds Among Community Colleges - The distribution of funds among community colleges for postsecondary and adult occupational education is based upon one factor; the number of Pell Grant recipients and recipients of Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) assistance served by the community college the prior year compared to the total number of Pell Grants and BIA assisted students statewide the prior year, a simple ratio (Section 232). THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION MET ALL FORMULA DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTSECONDARY/ADULT FUNDS DISTRIBUTION REGULAR AND CARRYOVER (SEE APPENDIX B).

Division of Funds Between Secondary and Postsecondary Levels of Instruction - Prior to 1984 funds received by the State were divided into two parts. Basic grants to the secondary school districts and community colleges were based upon a formula allocation utilizing factors of enrollments, wealth and special population students. The second part of the funds (43% were distributed by competitive grant process responding to Requests For Proposals (RFPs), which were developed based upon statewide needs for program improvement.

From 1977 until 1984 Federal Law required a minimum setaside for adult/postsecondary vocational education programs. In 1977 the minimum setaside for adult/postsecondary from Part A, Basic Grants, was 12%. During the seven-year period, distribution of basic grant funds to the community colleges remained static; the only change occurred when the State's basic grant allocations went up. The minimum 12% setaside for postsecondary programs from basic grants became the maximum.

From 1968 until 1984 secondary and postsecondary programs competed equally for Part B, program improvement funds. A review of Council reports from 1977 through 1984 indicated that the community colleges competed well for Part B funds, and in reality 43% of all program improvement funds went to the community college and university system.* The trend of 1977-1984 remained virtually unchanged until fiscal year 1990.

---

*Calculated from Council Distribution Reports 1977-1984 Part B.

The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act removed the setaside for adult/postsecondary occupational education programs and obligated the State to determine the instructional level split of funds. Since the funds for program improvement or competitive grants statewide were all but eliminated from the Act, the State had to take prompt action to determine the division of funds between the secondary and postsecondary program levels for basic grants.

Inasmuch as the funds which were utilized by the community colleges were combined with those expended by the four-year universities in most analysis conducted, the cost of teacher preparation and research and development had to be factored out. After all factors were considered, the Council concurred with the estimation that, over the ten years from 1981 to 1991, 25% of the available "program" funds had traditionally gone to the community colleges.

When investigating the concerns of secondary/postsecondary division of funds, the Council found that there was little documentation of long-term systemwide planning for the community colleges in Nevada. The Council endorsed the proposed 75% secondary, and 25% postsecondary split of funds. The first Three-Year State Plan for Vocational Education established the split of funds, and distribution to secondary school districts and community colleges were executed accordingly in FY92, FY93, and FY94. (See Appendix A, pages A7-10 and Appendix B, pages B1-4).

## CLOSING CONSIDERATIONS

In preparing the Council's recommendations regarding the distribution of funds among secondary and postsecondary institutions and levels, three major concerns were to be studied and considered:

1. have the issues of planning and record keeping, cited by the Council in 1990, changed regarding postsecondary programs in the last three years;
2. have program needs changed over the ten-year span of fiscal years 1983 to 1993 warranting a change in distribution; and,
3. do current conditions in occupational education and work preparation warrant reconsideration of the historical division of federal occupational education funds between secondary and postsecondary program levels?

Until Fiscal Year 1990, the State Council remained relatively silent on the issue of the distribution of funds among program levels. The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act eliminated, for the first time, a minimum setaside for the postsecondary institutions. The State

was left to decide the percentage amounts of the federal funds which would be allocated to each of the secondary and postsecondary levels.

The State Council was asked to assist in the deliberations as to the percentage of federal funds which would be allocated to the secondary schools and community colleges. Ultimately, the Council supported a split of funds which would result in seventy-five percent (75%) of the funds being distributed to secondary programs and twenty-five percent (25%) to the community colleges. The Council's decision was not based upon consideration of program needs or enrollments, but rather the lack of long-term planning documentation for community college occupational programs. Secondly, the community college systems seemed unable to report occupational program enrollments and completions in a manner understandable to the State Council membership or staff.

The Council began deliberations on the issue of split-of-funds between secondary and postsecondary program levels in February of 1992. It was determined that a ten-year comparison would be made and a public forum held to consider the issue of split-of-funds between secondary and postsecondary programs.

Planning and Record Keeping - Prior to 1983, the community colleges of Nevada functioned as independent agents of the system. Little or no common planning occurred among community colleges. Each institution was granted full autonomy to direct its instructional program, and little consideration was given to articulation even among colleges. From 1969 when the community colleges were first operational under Nevada Statute, the University Board of Regents allowed each college to evolve with little or no interference from central administration. The way the community colleges evolved in each of the communities did result in institutions which were responsive to the specific community's needs, but record keeping and an absence of systemwide planning made it nearly impossible to project the systems ability to respond to statewide needs.

During the same time period, secondary programs were highly influenced by the State Plan for Vocational Education and the development of program guides and the State Course of Study. While the State Plan and the utilization of federal funds were not intended to become the long-term planning tool for secondary occupational education, the school districts of Nevada had no other source of funds to improve or expand programs. Throughout the years, the State Board of Education serving as the State Board for Vocational Education, and the specifics of their State Plan have given direction to the development of occupational education programs.

Unlike the secondary programs, postsecondary (community college) programs were not given the same leadership through the

years. The State Plans, 1976 through 1986, were very soft on the direction given postsecondary programs. Often, criteria used for financial support of programs at the community colleges were established at the very minimum of levels simply to facilitate the distribution of funds. Inasmuch as the governance of the community college system was outside of the review of the State Board for Vocational Education, even the data required for the previous Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) and later the Occupational Education Reporting System (ORS) was held to a minimum.

For the most part, the community colleges have reported enrollments and completions to both the State Department of Education and the Employment Security Department Research Units on the basis of what could be gleaned from a disassociated database. For over fifteen years the data available on community college programs has been accepted with the caveat that "the community college data system is not compatible, and therefore, may not reflect a true picture of programs".

Since 1990, the community college system has undergone major changes in systemwide long-range planning as well as data maintenance for occupational education. A concerted systemwide direction has been undertaken by the University Board of Regents, and personnel have been specifically designated to manage the system. While maintaining a high level of individual college autonomy, the system has undertaken major efforts to define the occupational education future of the community college system and to maintain records on occupational education participants.

From 1990 through 1992 the Board of Regents, through staff leadership, has gone through an extensive process of evaluation and long-term planning. Extensive systemwide goal setting and strategic planning is reflected in three major documents distributed in 1993. The systemwide redirection is described in the following documents:

1. University and Community College System of Nevada Planning Report 1993-1997,
2. Nevada Responds to the Community College: CHANGING WITH THE TIMES: CHALLENGING THE FUTURE,
3. Strategic Directions for the University and Community College System of Nevada.

While the greatest preponderance of issues addressed in these documents still relate to the two universities, these planning documents reflect a new interest in the community colleges as a part of the higher education system, and address specifically a new era for occupational education in the system's strategic planning.

Strategic planning goals relating to "public accountability" have brought the community college data systems closer to meeting the needs for data on occupational related programs. SINCE 1988

THE COUNCIL HAS NOTED THAT THE LACK OF AN ADEQUATE DATA SYSTEM FOR OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS, COMBINED WITH THE SYSTEM'S UNWILLINGNESS OR INABILITY TO IDENTIFY THE INTENT OF THE STUDENT POPULATION, HAS RESULTED IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES BEING UNDERCREDITED FOR THE OCCUPATIONALLY RELATED WORK THEY HAVE DONE.

THE CURRENT CHANGES IN PLANNING AND RECORD KEEPING HAVE RESULTED IN THE COUNCIL'S RECONSIDERATION ON THE SPLIT-OF-FUNDS BETWEEN THE SECONDARY AND POSTSECONDARY LEVELS.

Program Changes 1983-1993 - At the close of 1982, the Community College System of Nevada served a total of 21,721 students (Changing With the Times: Challenging the Future, Nevada Board of Regents, 1993, p. 4). In 1990 the enrollments had grown to 37,276 with the equivalency of 11,131 fulltime students (Changing With the Times: Challenging the Future, Nevada Board of Regents, 1993, p. 4). Projected enrollments for 1997 are estimated to be 49,701 (Changing With the Times: Challenging the Future, Nevada Board of Regents, 1993, p. 14). Using a historical ratio of Fulltime Student Equivalency to enrollments, there will be the equivalent of 14,846 fulltime students enrolled in the community college system. Extending the existing data, by the year 2000, the community colleges will be serving more fulltime equivalences than they had in enrollments just twenty (20) years earlier.

In 1983, the reporting of postsecondary enrollments in occupational education programs and of program completers was so incomplete that no official report was made from the Vocational Education Data System. The only reporting of community college data appeared in the Nevada Employment Security Department, Supply Demand Report 1985, which was not published but rather provided in computer printout form. Inasmuch as the data from the Supply Demand Report was the basis for State planning, the data was accepted with all of its limitations.

By summing the total of completers by Dictionary of Occupational Title Codes reported by postsecondary institutions, 645 +/- individuals completed postsecondary occupational programs in 1983 (Nevada Department of Employment Security, 1985 Supply Demand Report). The State Plan for Vocational Education 1983-1985 described community college enrollments to be 5,400 systemwide (p. 39). Each time the figures quoted were used, the individual was cautioned that the data system for the community colleges was incomplete and the system was being updated.

Given the limitations of data, the Community College System of Nevada has expanded its services from approximately 5,400 occupationally declared students in 1983 to 13,258 in 1991 (Occupational Education Reporting System, 1992, Nevada Department of Education). In an eight-year period of time students declared as occupational had risen by 7,858 or 245.5%. These figures do not include individuals who enroll in occupational courses for employment improvement but do not declare a major. Using

straight line trend ratios from 1983 to 1997 it can be estimated that by 1997 occupationally declared enrollments will approximate 14,513 individuals. THESE CALCULATIONS DO NOT FACTOR IN THE OBVIOUS CHANGES IN THE WORKPLACE WHICH ARE FORCING ADULTS BACK INTO TRAINING FOR UPGRADING THEIR SKILLS OR NEW EMPLOYMENT.

The Summary Report of Nevada Secondary Vocational Education Information for Fiscal Year 1982-1983, prepared by the Nevada Department of Education Branch, page 15, reported a total of 15,553 students enrolled in one or more vocational classes in 1983. Of those individuals enrolled, 44.9% were considered Part A (students with a concentration of courses in one area of training) equating the enrollments for comparison to postsecondary programs, 6,983 students were declarable as "having a concentration of study in one area". Of all Part A enrollments, 44.5 % were classified as completers and 7.9% as leavers. Of the 6,983 students in "Job Preparation" programs 3,135 completed secondary programs in 1983.

In 1993, secondary enrollments in occupational education had increased to 21,041 (Nevada Department of Education Occupational Education Enrollment Reports 1993) from 15,553. From 1983 to 1993 secondary occupational enrollments have increased by 5,488 individuals or 35.29%. Using the same analysis technique applied to the postsecondary projections, it can be estimated that secondary occupational education enrollments will reach 24,000-plus by 1997.

By the year 1997 approximately 37.7% of all occupational students in the State will be declared occupational majors enrolled in community college programs. This calculation does not include those individuals who enroll in one or more occupational courses to upgrade their skills for existing employment.

Current Conditions in Occupational Education and Work Preparation - Job growth in Nevada has expanded in 1992 and 1993 beyond the wildest expectations of occupational education and job training planners. The total capacity of the education and training system falls short of meeting current employment demand by 22,221 individuals (An Analysis of the Adequacy and Effectiveness of the Job Training Partnership Act and Occupational Education Programs in Nevada, April 1993, Nevada Council on Occupational Education, page 5) based upon completion and entered employment reports prepared by the Nevada Departments of Education and Job Training.

The State of Nevada has never highly valued occupational education as an area of concern for spending funds. All of occupational education and training is so critically underfunded that program change and improvement is dependent upon scarce Federal funds derived from the vocational and training enactments of the U.S. Congress. Slowly, the general public and some educators have grown to recognize the importance of educational

programs designed to meet the needs of all students to gain meaningful employment and also be able to pursue postsecondary training and education. IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT IN NEVADA BOTH SECONDARY AND POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS MUST COMPETE FOR VERY SCARCE FUNDS FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION CHANGE.

The members of the Nevada Council on Occupational Education strongly believe in the future value of programs like Tech-Prep. To no avail, the Council has recommended increased State contribution to the advancement of occupational education since 1977. During the developmental years of the community colleges, programs in the emerging institutions were supported by the Nevada Legislature. Since 1989 the direct support of expanding community colleges has declined along with the State's ability to pay for services desired by the general public. Community college support has declined in relative economic value to the point that we now find ourselves unable to initiate new programs unless outside funds become available.

At the secondary level the number of certified vocational teachers have declined by 35 while enrollments have increased by over 5,000. Each day Nevada is less and less able to meet its manpower needs from within, and employees are being sought from outside the State. While we are seeing a massive inward movement of employees, our youth and adults needing occupational services are moving out of State seeking a less demanding labor market; UNFORTUNATELY THERE IS LITTLE TO INDICATE THAT THERE WILL BE A MAJOR CHANGE OF THESE CONDITIONS IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

The national concerns for a comprehensive school-to-work initiative combined with the political leaderships of Nevada's interest in capitalizing on the current new insight regarding education, will result in even greater demands upon the limited resources of occupational education. Every student prepared for work or further education or training will become the focus of the education until the year 2000. The Council's historical support of experiential-based learning for occupational education will soon be expanded to all students with very little new resources to make the change.

On August 31, 1993, the Council conducted an open forum concerning the distribution of funds among programs emphasizing the split between secondary and postsecondary program levels (a full verbatim transcript of the open forum is available through the State Council office). The discussion of split has not changed since 1990. Each level believes that the split must be considered in favor of the respective level because the only available "Change" funds are those derived from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

The Council believes that the split-of-funds between the secondary and postsecondary levels should be brought into adjustment with current enrollments. Further, the need to place priorities on programs which demonstrate a high level of student

transition from secondary to postsecondary levels is evident. By the year 2000 over 70% of all jobs available will require some training beyond high school.

BASED UPON THE HISTORICAL REVIEW PRESENTED IN THIS DOCUMENT AND THE ANALYSIS CONDUCTED BY THE COUNCIL AS REPORTED, THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS AMENDMENT OF THE CURRENT DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS BETWEEN SECONDARY AND POSTSECONDARY PROGRAM LEVELS.

RECOMMENDATION

THE STATE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS AMENDING THE STATE PLAN FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROVIDING 68% OF STATE BASIC GRANT FUNDS TO SECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND 32% TO POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS.

LIST OF APPENDIX

Distribution of Funds Among Secondary School Districts..... Appendix A

Distribution of Funds Among Community Colleges..... Appendix B

APPENDIX A

**Actual LEA Allotment for the 70% Chapter 1 State Distribution Portion of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula.**

| Agency | Chapter 1 Funds Received FY91 | % Of State Total | Original Formula Allocation | % of Act. Allotment Applicants Only | Allocation of Unobligated Recipient Funds | Total Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 203,403.26 | 2.5762 | 42,273.00 | 2.7371 | 2640.00 | 44,913.00 |
| Churchill | 165,109.73 | 2.0912 | 34,314.00 | 2.2218 | 2143.00 | 36,457.00 |
| Clark | 5,150,483.29 | 65.2343 | 1,070,426.00 | 69.3077 | 66,840.00 | 1,137,266.00 |
| Douglas | 130,297.44 | 1.6503 | 27,080.00 | 1.7534 | 1691.00 | 28,771.00 |
| Elko | 259,600.24 | 3.2880 | 53,953.00 | 3.4933 | 3369.00 | 57,322.00 |
| Esmeralda* | 0.00 | 0.0000 | NA | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Eureka * | 54,586.84 | 0.6914 | 11,345.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Humboldt | 230,402.04 | 2.9182 | 47,885.00 | 3.1004 | 2,990.00 | 50,875.00 |
| Lander * | 53,710.40 | 0.6803 | 11,163.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lincoln * | 43,764.03 | 0.5543 | 9,095.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lyon | 159,141.91 | 2.0156 | 33,074.00 | 2.1415 | 2,065.00 | 35,139.00 |
| Mineral * | 133,427.54 | 1.6900 | 27,731.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Nye * | 129,302.80 | 1.6377 | 26,873.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Pershing * | 40,282.80 | 0.5102 | 8,372.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Storey * | 8,951.73 | 0.1134 | 1,861.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Washoe | 1,034,422.42 | 13.1017 | 214,985.00 | 13.9198 | 13,424.00 | 228,409.00 |
| White Pine | 98,469.06 | 1.2472 | 20,465.00 | 1.3251 | 1,278.00 | 21,743.00 |
| TOTALS | 7,895,355.53 | 100% | 1,640,895.00 | 100% | 96,440.00 | 1,640,895.00 |

**Actual LEA Allotment for the 20% Handicapped Student Enrollments Portion of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula**

| Agency | Student Count | % Of State Total | Original Formula Allocation | % of Act. Allotment Applicants Only | Allocation of Unobligated Recipient Funds | Total Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 863 | 4.7790 | 22,405.00 | 5.0880 | 1,449.00 | 23,854.00 |
| Churchill | 373 | 2.0656 | 9,684.00 | 2.1992 | 626.00 | 10,310.00 |
| Clark | 9,800 | 54.2696 | 254,431.00 | 57.7798 | 16,456.00 | 270,887.00 |
| Douglas | 453 | 2.5086 | 11,761.00 | 2.6709 | 761.00 | 12,522.00 |
| Elko | 703 | 3.8930 | 18,251.00 | 4.1447 | 1,180.00 | 19,431.00 |
| Esmeralda* | 26 | 0.1440 | 675.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Eureka * | 52 | 0.2880 | 1,350.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Humboldt | 238 | 1.3180 | 6,179.00 | 1.4032 | 400.00 | 6,579.00 |
| Lander * | 194 | 1.0743 | 5,037.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lincoln * | 107 | 0.5925 | 2,778.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lyon | 500 | 2.7688 | 12,981.00 | 2.9479 | 840.00 | 13,821.00 |
| Mineral * | 97 | 0.5371 | 2,518.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Nye * | 485 | 2.6858 | 12,592.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Pershing * | 97 | 0.5372 | 2,518.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Storey * | 39 | 0.2160 | 1,013.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Washoe | 3,837 | 21.2482 | 99,617.00 | 22.6224 | 6,443.00 | 106,060.00 |
| White Pine | 194 | 1.0743 | 5,037.00 | 1.1439 | 326.00 | 5,363.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **18,058** | **100%** | **468,827.00** | **100%** | **28,481.00** | **468,827.00** |

**Actual LEA Allotment for the 10% Total Student Enrollment Portion of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula.**

| Agency | Student Count End of Sept. FY 91 | Adults Enrolled in Occupational Training FY 91 | % of State Student/ Adult Total | Original Formula Allocation | % of Act. Allotment Applicants only | Allocation Unobligated Recipient Fund | Total Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 6,351 | 0 | 3.1466 | 7,376.00 | 3.2899 | 336.00 | 7,712.00 |
| Churchill | 3,600 | 0 | 1.7836 | 4,181.00 | 1.8647 | 190.00 | 4,371.00 |
| Clark | 121,984 | 322 | 60.5954 | 142,044.00 | 63.3520 | 6,462.00 | 148,506.00 |
| Douglas | 5,515 | 0 | 2.7324 | 6,405.00 | 2.8566 | 291.00 | 6,696.00 |
| Elko | 7,811 | 0 | 3.8699 | 9,072.00 | 4.0461 | 413.00 | 9,485.00 |
| Esmeralda* | 132 | 0 | 0.0654 | 153.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Eureka * | 286 | 0 | 0.1417 | 332.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Humboldt | 2,999 | 0 | 1.4858 | 3,483.00 | 1.5534 | 158.00 | 3,641.00 |
| Lander * | 1,536 | 0 | 0.7610 | 1,784.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lincoln * | 1,055 | 52 | 0.5484 | 1,286.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lyon | 4,119 | 100 | 2.0903 | 4,900.00 | 2.1854 | 223.00 | 5,123.00 |
| Mineral * | 1,119 | 24 | 0.5663 | 1,327.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Nye * | 3,441 | 0 | 1.7048 | 3,996.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Pershing * | 796 | 0 | 0.3944 | 925.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Storey * | 342 | 0 | 0.1694 | 397.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Washoe | 38,466 | 26 | 19.0706 | 44,704.00 | 19.938 | 2,034.00 | 46,738.00 |
| White Pine | 1,764 | 0 | 0.8740 | 2,049.00 | .9139 | 93.00 | 2,142.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **201,316** | **524** | **100%** | **234,414.00** | **100%** | **10,200.00** | **234,414.00** |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Actual FY93 LEA Allotment for the 70% Chapter 1 State Distribution Portion of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula.**

| Agency | Chapter 1 Funds Received FY92 | % Of State Total | Original Formula Allocation | % of Act. Allotment Applicants Only | Allocation of Unobligated Recipient Funds | Total Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 302,802.46 | 2.4992 | 46,104.00 | 2.6475 | 2,737.00 | 48,841.00 |
| Churchill | 248,506.22 | 2.0511 | 37,838.00 | 2.1729 | 2,246.00 | 40,084.00 |
| Clark | 8,029,614.39 | 66.2747 | 1,222,604.00 | 70.2086 | 72,571.00 | 1,295,175.00 |
| Douglas | 202,376.33 | 1.6704 | 30,815.00 | 1.7696 | 1,829.00 | 32,644.00 |
| Elko | 386,895.92 | 3.1934 | 58,910.00 | 3.3829 | 3,497.00 | 62,407.00 |
| Esmeralda* | 0.00 | 0.0000 | NA | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Eureka * | 75,576.77 | 0.6238 | 11,508.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Humboldt | 329,133.88 | 2.7166 | 50,115.00 | 2.8779 | 2,975.00 | 53,090.00 |
| Lander * | 81,099.34 | 0.6694 | 12,349.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lincoln * | 68,450.82 | 0.5650 | 10,423.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lyon | 227,673.37 | 1.8792 | 34,667.00 | 1.9902 | 2,057.00 | 36,724.00 |
| Mineral * | 187,355.95 | 1.5464 | 28,527.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Nye * | 195,680.05 | 1.6151 | 29,795.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Pershing * | 57,290.36 | 0.4729 | 8,724.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Storey * | 13,392.55 | 0.1105 | 2,039.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Washoe | 1,562,464.28 | 12.8962 | 237,903.00 | 13.6617 | 14,121.00 | 252,024.00 |
| White Pine | 147,318.06 | 1.2159 | 22,431.00 | 1.2881 | 1,332.00 | 23,763.00 |
| TOTALS | 12,115,648.75 | 100% | 1,844,752.00 | 100% | 103,365.00 | 1,844,752.00 |

**Actual FY93 LEA Allotment for the 20% Handicapped Student Enrollments Portion of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula**

| Agency | Student Count | % Of State Total | Original Formula Allocation | % of Act. Allotment Applicants Only | Allocation of Unobligated Recipient Funds | Total Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 931 | 4.6650 | 24,590.00 | 4.948 | 1,488.00 | 26,078.00 |
| Churchill | 436 | 2.1847 | 11,515.00 | 2.3170 | 697.00 | 12,212.00 |
| Clark | 10,940 | 54.8179 | 288,930.00 | 58.1357 | 17,487.00 | 306,417.00 |
| Douglas | 501 | 2.5104 | 13,231.00 | 2.6622 | 801.00 | 14,032.00 |
| Elko | 740 | 3.7080 | 19,544.00 | 3.9325 | 1,183.00 | 20,727.00 |
| Esmeralda* | 50 | 0.2505 | 1,320.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Eureka * | 25 | 0.1253 | 660.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Humboldt | 280 | 1.4030 | 7,395.00 | 1.4881 | 448.00 | 7,843.00 |
| Lander * | 198 | 0.9921 | 5,229.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lincoln * | 147 | 0.7366 | 3,882.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lyon | 567 | 2.8411 | 14,974.00 | 3.0129 | 906.00 | 15,880.00 |
| Mineral * | 107 | 0.5362 | 2,826.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Nye * | 446 | 2.2348 | 11,779.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Pershing * | 117 | 0.5863 | 3,090.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Storey * | 49 | 0.2455 | 1,294.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Washoe | 4,241 | 21.2507 | 112,006.00 | 22.5368 | 6,779.00 | 118,785.00 |
| White Pine | 182 | 0.9120 | 4,807.00 | 0.9672 | 291.00 | 5,098.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **19,957** | **100%** | **527,072.00** | **100%** | **30,080.00** | **527,072.00** |

**Actual FY93 LEA Allotment for the 10% Total Student Enrollment Portion of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula.**

| Agency | Student Count End of Sept. FY 92 | Adults Enrolled in Occupational Training FY 92 | % of State Student/ Adult Total | Original Formula Allocation | % of Act. Allotment Applicants only | Allocation Unobligated Recipient Fund | Total Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 6,569 | 0 | 3.0931 | 8,151.00 | 3.2301 | 361.00 | 8,512.00 |
| Churchill | 3,722 | 0 | 1.7526 | 4,619.00 | 1.8304 | 205.00 | 4,824.00 |
| Clark | 129,233 | 322 | 61.0027 | 160,764.00 | 63.7070 | 7,127.00 | 167,891.00 |
| Douglas | 5,833 | 0 | 2.7465 | 7,238.00 | 2.8682 | 321.00 | 7,559.00 |
| Elko | 8,257 | 0 | 3.8879 | 10,246.00 | 4.0602 | 454.00 | 10,700.00 |
| Esmeralda* | 148 | 0 | 0.0697 | 184.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Eureka * | 302 | 0 | 0.1422 | 375.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Humboldt | 3,184 | 0 | 1.4992 | 3,950.00 | 1.5653 | 175.00 | 4,125.00 |
| Lander * | 1,523 | 0 | 0.7171 | 1,890.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lincoln * | 1,090 | 52 | 0.5377 | 1,417.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Lyon | 4,336 | 134 | 2.1048 | 5,547.00 | 2.1981 | 246.00 | 5,793.00 |
| Mineral * | 1,113 | 24 | 0.5354 | 1,411.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Nye * | 3,519 | 0 | 1.6570 | 4,367.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Pershing * | 822 | 0 | 0.3870 | 1,020.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Storey * | 422 | 0 | 0.1987 | 523.00 | NA | NA | 0.00 |
| Washoe | 40,028 | 34 | 18.8637 | 49,713.00 | 19.7120 | 2,205.00 | 51,918.00 |
| White Pine | 1,709 | 0 | 0.8047 | 2,120.00 | 0.8401 | 94.00 | 2,214.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **211,810** | **566** | **100%** | **263,536.00** | **100%** | **11,187.00** | **263,536.00** |

**Total FY 92 LEA Allocations for Secondary School Programs**
**(New Carl Perkins funds only)**

NOTE: The allotted funds are based on a split of Title II, Part C funds of 75% to secondary programs and 25% to postsecondary programs. A total of $2,344,136 would be available to agencies for secondary school programs out of the total Basic Grant funds of $3,125,515. The projected secondary amounts are based on $4,241,799 federal allocation under Title II to Nevada as provided by USDE on the worksheet for determining Basic Grant Setaside. See Tables 2-4 for detailed breakout of each formula category.

| Agency | 70% Chapter 1 Allocation | 20% Handicap Allocation | 10% Student Enrollment Allocation | Total LEA Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 44,913.00 | 23,854.00 | 7,712.00 | 76,479.00 |
| Churchill | 36,457.00 | 10,310.00 | 4,371.00 | 51,138.00 |
| Clark | 1,137,266.00 | 270,887.00 | 148,506.00 | 1,556,659.00 |
| Douglas | 28,771.00 | 12,522.00 | 6,696.00 | 47,989.00 |
| Elko | 57,322.00 | 19,431.00 | 9,485.00 | 86,238.00 |
| Humboldt | 50,875.00 | 6,579.00 | 3,641.00 | 61,095.00 |
| Lyon | 35,139.00 | 13,821.00 | 5,123.00 | 54,083.00 |
| Washoe | 228,409.00 | 106,060.00 | 46,738.00 | 381,207.00 |
| White Pine | 21,743.00 | 5,363.00 | 2,142.00 | 29,248.00 |
| TOTALS | 1,640,895.00 | 468,827.00 | 234,414.00 | 2,344,136.00 |

**Total FY 92 LEA Allocations for Secondary School Programs**
**(SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS ALLOCATION)**

NOTE: The allotted supplemental funds are based on a split of carry-over funds of 70% to secondary programs and 30% to postsecondary programs. A total of $292,818 would be available to agencies for secondary school programs out of the total supplemental funds of $418,311.

| Agency | % of State Basic Grant Allocation | Supplemental Allocation | New Funds Basic Grant Allocation | Total LEA Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 3.2626 | 9,553.00 | 76,479.00 | 86,032.00 |
| Churchill | 2.1815 | 6,388.00 | 51,138.00 | 57,526.00 |
| Clark | 66.4065 | 194,450.00 | 1,556,659.00 | 1,751,109.00 |
| Douglas | 2.0472 | 5,995.00 | 47,989.00 | 53,984.00 |
| Elko | 3.6789 | 10,772.00 | 86,238.00 | 97,010.00 |
| Humboldt | 2.6063 | 7,632.00 | 61,095.00 | 68,727.00 |
| Lyon | 2.3072 | 6,756.00 | 54,083.00 | 60,839.00 |
| Washoe | 16.2621 | 47,618.00 | 381,207.00 | 428,825.00 |
| White Pine | 1.2477 | 3,654.00 | 29,248.00 | 32,902.00 |
| TOTALS | 100.0000 | 292,818.00 | 2,344,136.00 | 2,636,954.00 |

**Total FY 93 LEA Allocations for Secondary School Programs** **FY93**
**(New Carl Perkins funds only)**

NOTE: The allotted funds are based on a split of Title II, Part C funds of 75% to secondary programs and 25% to postsecondary programs. A total of $2,635,360 would be available to agencies for secondary school programs out of the total Basic Grant funds of $3,513,814. The projected secondary amounts are based on $4,699,626 federal allocation under Title II to Nevada as provided by USDE on the worksheet for determining Basic Grant Setaside. See Tables 2-4 for detailed breakout of each formula category.

| Agency | 70% Chapter 1 Allocation | 20% Handicap Allocation | 10% Student Enrollment Allocation | Total LEA Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 48,841.00 | 26,078.00 | 8,512.00 | 83,431.00 |
| Churchill | 40,084.00 | 12,212.00 | 4,824.00 | 57,120.00 |
| Clark | 1,295,175.00 | 306,417.00 | 167,891.00 | 1,769,483.00 |
| Douglas | 32,644.00 | 14,032.00 | 7,559.00 | 54,235.00 |
| Elko | 62,407.00 | 20,727.00 | 10,700..00 | 93,834.00 |
| Humboldt | 53,090.00 | 7,843.00 | 4,125.00 | 65,058.00 |
| Lyon | 36,724.00 | 15,880.00 | 5,793.00 | 58,397.00 |
| Washoe | 252,024.00 | 118,785.00 | 51,918.00 | 422,727.00 |
| White Pine | 23,763.00 | 5,098.00 | 2,214.00 | 31,075.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **1,844,752.00** | **527,072.00** | **263,536.00** | **2,635,360.00** |

**Total FY 93 LEA Allocations for Secondary School Programs**
**(INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS ALLOCATION)**

NOTE: The allotted supplemental funds are based on a split of carry-over funds of 70% to secondary programs and 30% to postsecondary programs. A total of $292,427 is available to agencies during FY93 for secondary school programs out of the total supplemental funds of $417,752.73 setaside for Basic Grant recipients.

| Agency | % of State Basic Grant Allocation | Supplemental Allocation | New Funds Basic Grant Allocation | Total LEA Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carson | 3.1658 | 9,258.00 | 83,431.00 | 92,689.00 |
| Churchill | 2.1674 | 6,338.00 | 57,120.00 | 63,458.00 |
| Clark | 67.1439 | 196,347.00 | 1,769,483.00 | 1,965,830.00 |
| Douglas | 2.0580 | 6,018.00 | 54,235.00 | 60,253.00 |
| Elko | 3.5606 | 10,412.00 | 93,834.00 | 104,246.00 |
| Humboldt | 2.4687 | 7,219.00 | 65,058.00 | 72,277.00 |
| Lyon | 2.2159 | 6,480.00 | 58,397.00 | 64,877.00 |
| Washoe | 16.0406 | 46,907.00 | 422,727.00 | 469,634.00 |
| White Pine | 1.1791 | 3,448.00 | 31,075.00 | 34,523.00 |
| TOTALS | 100.0000 | 292,427.00 | 2,635,360.00 | 2,927,787.00 |

APPENDIX B

**Community College Allotment using the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula.**

NOTE: The allotted funds are based on a split of Title II, Part C funds of 75% to secondary programs and 25% to postsecondary programs for new Carl Perkins Funds. A total of $781,379 would be available to agencies for postsecondary programs out of the total Basic Grant funds of $3,125,515. The projected amounts are based on a $4,241,799 federal allocation under Title II to Nevada as provided by USDE on the worksheet for determining Basic Grant Setaside.

| Agency | Pell Grant Count FY 91 | % Of State Total | New Funds |
|---|---|---|---|
| CCSN | 411 | 34.2785 | 267,845.00 |
| NNCC | 130 | 10.8424 | 84,720.00 |
| TMCC | 347 | 28.9408 | 226,137.00 |
| WNCC | 311 | 25.9383 | 202,677.00 |
| TOTALS | 1,199 | 100% | 781,379.00 |

NDE/OccEd

**Community College Supplemental Allotment using the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act carry-over funds.**

NOTE: The allotted funds are based on a split of Title II, Part C funds of 70% to secondary programs and 30% to postsecondary programs for carry-over Carl Perkins Funds. A total of $125,493 would be available to agencies for postsecondary programs out of the total carry-over funds of $418,311 setaside for Basic Grant recipients.

| Agency | Pell Grant Count FY 91 | % Of State Total | Supplemental Funds |
|---|---|---|---|
| CCSN | 411 | 34.2785 | 43,017.00 |
| NNCC | 130 | 10.8424 | 13,606.00 |
| TMCC | 347 | 28.9408 | 36,319.00 |
| WNCC | 311 | 25.9383 | 32,551.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **1,199** | **100%** | **$125,493.00** |

CUMULATIVE TOTAL

| | NEW FUNDS | SUPPLEMENTAL | TOTAL FY92 GRANT |
|---|---|---|---|
| CCSN | 267,845.00 | 43,017.00 | $310,862.00 |
| NNCC | 84,720.00 | 13,606.00 | $ 98,326.00 |
| TMCC | 226,137.00 | 36,319.00 | $262,456.00 |
| WNCC | 202,677.00 | 32,551.00 | $235,228.00 |
| TOTAL | 781,379.00 | 125,493.00 | $906,872.00 |

**FY93 Community College Allotment using the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Formula.**

NOTE: The allotted funds are based on a split of Title II, Part C funds of 75% to secondary programs and 25% to postsecondary programs for new Carl Perkins Funds. A total of $878,454 would be available to agencies for postsecondary programs out of the total Basic Grant funds of $3,513,814. The amounts are based on a $4,699,626 federal allocation under Title II to Nevada as provided by USDE on the worksheet for determining Basic Grant Setaside.

| Agency | Pell Grant Count FY 91 | % Of State Total | New Funds |
|---|---|---|---|
| CCSN | 479 | 27.8165 | 244,355.00 |
| NNCC | 183 | 10.6272 | 93,355.00 |
| TMCC | 658 | 38.2114 | 335,670.00 |
| WNCC | 402 | 23.3449 | 205,074.00 |
| TOTALS | 1,722 | 100% | 878,454.00 |

**FY93 Community College Supplemental Allotment for the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act carry-over funds.**

NOTE: The allotted funds are based on a split of Title II, Part C funds of 70% to secondary programs and 30% to postsecondary programs for carry-over Carl Perkins Funds. A total of $125,325 is available to agencies during FY93 for postsecondary programs out of the total carry-over funds of $417,752.73 setaside for Basic Grant recipients.

| Agency | Pell Grant Count FY 92 | % Of State Total | Supplemental Funds |
|---|---|---|---|
| CCSN | 479 | 27.8165 | 34,861.00 |
| NNCC | 183 | 10.6272 | 13,319.00 |
| TMCC | 658 | 38.2114 | 47,888.00 |
| WNCC | 402 | 23.3449 | 29,257.00 |
| TOTALS | 1,722 | 100% | $125,325.00 |

CUMULATIVE TOTAL

| | NEW FUNDS | SUPPLEMENTAL | TOTAL FY93 GRANT |
|---|---|---|---|
| CCSN | 244,355.00 | 34,861.00 | $279,216.00 |
| NNCC | 93,355.00 | 13,319.00 | $106,674.00 |
| TMCC | 335,670.00 | 47,888.00 | $383,558.00 |
| WNCC | 205,074.00 | 29,257.00 | $234,331.00 |
| TOTAL | 878,454.00 | 125,325.00 | $1,003,779.00 |

# Nevada State Board of Education

Yvonne Shaw, President
Sparks

Liliam Hickey, Vice President
Las Vegas

Peggy Lear Bowen
Carson City

Frank Brown
Carson City

Carley Sullivan
Elko

William Hanlon
Las Vegas

Patricia Krajcech
Henderson

Carol Lenhart
Las Vegas

Marianne Long
Las Vegas

Steve Stallworth
Las Vegas

Terry Garcia-Cahlan
Las Vegas

Jill Van Buskirk
Las Vegas